



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,610	05/18/2004	Zheng Wang	ACMP0084USA	3609
27765	7590	11/01/2005	EXAMINER	
NORTH AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION P.O. BOX 506 MERRIFIELD, VA 22116			CARTER, WILLIAM JOSEPH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2875	

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/709,610	WANG, ZHENG	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William J. Carter	2875	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 May 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 May 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>07/30/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because "reflect piece" should be "reflective piece," as it is referred to throughout the disclosure. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 5, and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Witte et al. (6,831,759).

With respect to claim 1, Witte teaches a scanner (60) comprising: a light source (64A or 64B) for generating light; a reflective piece (110) including one protrusion (114) for reflecting the light from the light source; a lens (70) for transmitting the light from the light source and the reflective piece; and a sensor (72) for detecting the light from the lens.

As for claim 5, Witte shows the protrusion (114) of the reflective piece (110) is triangular (Fig. 2).

As for claim 8, Witte shows the scanner (60) is a flatbed scanner (Fig. 6).

As for claim 9, Witte teaches the light source (64A or 64B) is a fluorescent tube (column 3, lines 1-4).

As for claim 10, Witte teaches the sensor (72) is a charge coupled device (CCD) (column 3, lines 12-14).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Witte in view of Edwards, Jr. (6,092,913).

With respect to claim 2, Witte teaches all of the claimed elements as disclosed as well as the protrusion (114) being located at the center of the reflective piece (110) (Fig. 2). Witte does not teach the protrusion of the reflective piece is for reflecting part of the light from the light source to two sides of the light source. Edwards, drawn to fluorescent lighting and desiring even lighting, teaches a reflective piece (44) with a protrusion (98) for reflecting part of the light from the light source (42) to two sides of the light source (Fig. 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to use the protrusion of Edwards in the scanner of Witte, in order to provide lighting with high efficiency and a low profile (Abstract).

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Witte in view of Hoffmann (2,567,561).

With respect to claims 3 and 4, Witte teaches all of the claimed elements as disclosed above, as well as the reflective piece comprises two protrusions (112A and 112B) located at two sides of the reflecting piece for reflecting the part of the light from the light source (64A or 64B) to the two sides of the light source (Fig. 2). Witte does not teach the reflective piece further comprising a dark section decreasingly distributed from the center to two sides of the reflective piece for absorbing part of the light from the light source. Hoffmann, drawn to uniform intensity illumination, teaches a reflective piece (column 4, line 45) with a dark section (24) decreasingly distributed from the center to the two sides of the reflective piece for absorbing part of the light from the light source (column 4, lines 53-62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to use the reflective piece of Hoffmann in the scanner of Witte in order to accomplish uniform illumination intensity (column 2, lines 39-45).

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Witte in view of Verfuerth (6,585,396).

With respect to claim 6, Witte teaches all of the claimed elements as disclosed above, except for the protrusion of the reflective piece is arc-shaped. Verfuerth, drawn to fluorescent lighting, shows a reflective piece (4'') has protrusions (protrusion between items 4'') that are arc-shaped (Fig. 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to use the protrusions of Verfuerth in the

Art Unit: 2875

scanner of Witte, in order to better reflect fluorescent tube light away from the reflector (column 1, lines 42-44).

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Witte in view of Gatto et al. (6,034,784).

With respect to claim 7, Witte teaches all of the claimed elements as disclosed above, except for the scanner is a paper feed scanner. Gatto, drawn to scanners, teaches a paper feed scanner (Abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to use the paper feed apparatus of Gatto in the scanner of Witte, in order to ensure that documents are perfectly aligned before they are scanned (Abstract).

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William J. Carter whose telephone number is (571)272-0959. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Renee S. Luebke can be reached on (571)272-2009. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2875

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

wjc
10/28/05



RENEE LUEBKE
PRIMARY EXAMINER